

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-22, 24-26, and 28-43 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 20, 31, and 43 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 20 and 31 are the independent claims.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 2, 4-19, and 34-42 are allowed. Claims 29 and 30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants appreciate that claims 1, 2, 4-19, and 34-42 are allowed; and the indication of allowable subject matter found in claims 29 and 30. However, Applicants submit that claims 20-22, 24-28, 31-22, and 43 are also allowable in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

**Applicant Initiated Interview Summary**

The courtesies extended by Examiner Do to Applicants' representative, **David J. Cho, Reg. No. 48,078**, during a personal interview conducted on October 27, 2010, are acknowledged and appreciated. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Examiner's Interview Summary and in the following Applicant Initiated Interview Summary. As required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), Applicants' summary of that interview is as follows:

1. Brief Description of any Exhibit Shown

An exhibit, illustrating the embodiment described in the instant specification (i.e., "Natural Evaporation Type Humidifier, Humidify Element and Humidifier Case"), was shown or demonstrated during the interview.

2. Identification of the Claims Discussed

The Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed independent claims 20 and 31.

3. Identification of the Specific Prior Art Discussed

The Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed U.S. Patent No. 4,148,849 to Steiner and U.S. Patent No. 2,717,148 to Hall.

4. Identification of the Proposed Amendments

A proposed amendment was proposed during the interview.

5. Summary of the Arguments Presented to the Examiner

Applicants' representative presented arguments regarding the failure of the applied reference to disclose the subject matter of independent claim 20. More specifically, Applicants' representative argued that the Steiner and Hall references do not disclose or suggest "a center fold portion that is formed as a **zig-zag** shape," as recited in claim 20. The Examiner agreed, but indicated that the language found in claim 20, as broadly interpreted, is sufficient that the applied references read on claim 20. The remainder of the interview was directed to discussing a level of recitation needed to clearly define this relationship, thereby obviating the rejection based on the applied references.

6. General Indication of Other Pertinent Matters Discussed

In regard to claim 31, the Examiner requested that claim 31 be amended to either depend from allowable claim 20 or include the subject matter of claim 20.

7. General Outcome of the Interview

The Examiner and Applicants' representative generally agreed on the nature of the subject matter recited in independent claims 20 and 31. The Examiner further indicated that review of the applied references would be required before reaching any conclusions as to whether the outstanding rejections based thereon would be withdrawn, and that further searching may be required prior to placing the application in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 20, 21, 25, 28, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,717,148 to Hall (hereinafter "**the Hall reference**"); claims 20-22, 24-28, and 31-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 54-36357 (hereinafter "**JP '357**"); and claims 20-21, 25, 28, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,399,299 to Stengel et al. (hereinafter "**the Stengel reference**"). Applicants submit that the rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed and agreed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references disclose or suggest a humidifying element, comprising, *inter alia*:

**a plurality of humidifying segments by folding a sheet-shaped absorptive member into approximately half in a longitudinal direction along a center fold portion that is formed as a zig-zag shape and a plurality of sectional fold portions that is formed in a direction approximately perpendicular to the center fold portion to create alternate plurality of humidifying segments.**

For instance, as shown in *at least* FIGS. 7, 8 10, and 11, the center fold portion **60** (formed as a "zig-zag") may be formed so as to fold the humidifying element **58** into approximately half in a longitudinal direction (i.e., the humidifying element 58 may be

folded into two by the center fold portion (zig-zag shape) 60. Further, due to the zig-zag shaped center portion and the plurality of sectional fold portions **62** (*formed in a perpendicular direction*), the humidifying segments 68 (and a part of center fold portion 60) may be formed into the shape as shown in FIGS. 8, 10, and 11. Hence, the element “a center fold portion” 60 that is formed as a zig-zag shape and the plurality of sectional fold portions 62 in claim 20 **create the “alternate” plurality of humidifying segments** (i.e., a portion of neighboring segments do not overlap each other in the direction of side view shown in FIG. 10). Accordingly, the shapes of neighboring humidifying segments are different with respect to each other in the direction of FIG. 10. The center fold portion 60 having the zig-zag shape thus makes the plurality of humidifying element 58, as shown in FIGS. 8, 10, and 11.

In contrast, the center fold portion (to fold the humidify element into two) of Hall is **a straight line**. As such, the center fold portion (zig-zag shape) of claim 20 and the center fold portion (straight line) of Hall are completely, extremely different. Further, the Steiner and JP ‘357 references are similar to the Hall reference, and thus, completely different with respect to the features taught in claim 20.

In addition, as shown in FIG. 10, the shape and configuration of neighboring segments 68 of claim 20 are *different* with respect to the each other, whereas all of the humidifying segments of Hall, Steiner and JP ‘357 are the *same* with respect to each other, which overlap each other in the direction of a side view.

Therefore, Applicants submit that none of the applied references of Hall, JP ‘357, and Steiner, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, **“a plurality of humidifying segments by folding a sheet-shaped absorptive member into approximately half in a longitudinal direction along a center fold portion that is formed as a zig-zag shape and a plurality of sectional fold portions that is formed in a direction approximately perpendicular to**

the center fold portion to create alternate plurality of humidifying segments,” as recited in amended claim 20.

Since the Hall, the JP '357, and the Stengel references fail to disclose each and every element of claim 20, they cannot provide a basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and, thus, are allowable. Claims 21, 22, 24-28, and 31-33, depend from amended claim 20 and, therefore, allowable for similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 20.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the § 102 rejection of claims 20-22, 24-28, and 31-33.

#### **Request for Interview**

Applicants respectfully request, prior to the issuance of an action on the merits, that the Examiner grant an interview (telephonic or in-person) with Applicants' representative in order to discuss the Office Action, and the differences between the cited prior art and the subject matter cited in the claims.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Further, the above remarks demonstrate the failings of the outstanding rejections, and are sufficient to overcome the rejections. However, these remarks are not intended to, nor need they, comprehensively address each and every reason for the patentability of the claimed subject matter over the applied prior art.

Accordingly, Applicants do not contend that the claims are patentable solely on the basis of the particular claim elements discussed above.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned, at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNES DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

JAC/DJC:has  
1037222.1